

based upon the same surname and that surname is normally written in some alphabet other than the Latin alphabet, and (2) has the same termination and/or suffix, but the two names differ from one another in spelling only by reason of differences adopted in the transliteration of the surname comprised in the generic names (or trivial names) in question, the two generic names in question (or, as the case may be, the two trivial names in question) are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

**REQUEST FOR A RULING ON THE QUESTION WHETHER ANY TWO NAMES, EACH BASED UPON A MODERN PATRONYMIC, ARE TO BE REGARDED AS HOMONYMS OF ONE ANOTHER, WHEN THE PATRONYMICS IN QUESTION ARE IDENTICAL IN SPELLING BUT DIFFER THROUGH THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF AN UMLAUT OR OTHER DIACRITIC MARK**

By HELEN M. MUIR-WOOD, D.Sc.

(Department of Geology, British Museum (Natural History), London)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)538)**

1. The object of the present application is to obtain from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature a ruling on the question whether the members of any given pair of generic names (or trivial names), each based upon a modern patronymic are to be regarded as homonyms of one another when the names in question are identical with one another except for the fact that the patronymic on which one of the names is based is distinguished by an umlaut or other diacritic mark, while the patronymic on which the other name is based is not so distinguished or is distinguished by a different diacritic mark.

2. An actual case of the above kind has arisen in the course of recent work. The particulars are as follows :—

(1) *Törnquistia* Reed, 1896

The name *Törnquistia* Reed (F.R.C.), 1896 (*Quart. J. geol. Soc. Lond.* 52 : 433) (Class Trilobita) was introduced as the name of a new subgenus of the genus *Cyphaspis* Burmeister, 1843 (*Organ. Trilob.* : 104). The nominal species *Cyphaspis* (*Törnquistia*) *nicholsoni*, then a new species, was designated as the type species of the new subgenus *Törnquistia* Reed. Reed referred in a footnote to Törnquist, 1884. *Undersökn. öfv Siljans. Trilobitenfauna ota Sver. geol. Undersökn., Lund.* 20 : No. 2. There is, therefore, no doubt that it was the Swedish palaeontologist Törnquist after whom the subgeneric name *Törnquistia* was given by Reed.

(2) *Tornquistia* Paeckelmann, 1930

The name *Tornquistia* Paeckelmann, 1930 (*Abh. preuss. geol. Landesanst.* (n. s.) **122**: 218, 277) was published as the name of a new genus of Brachiopoda. The nominal species *Leptaena* (*Chonetes*) *polita* McCoy, 1852 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (2)**10**: 421) was designated as the type species of this genus.

3. Reed's trilobite genus is named after Sven Leonhard Törnquist, the Swedish palaeontologist who published papers on Lower Palaeozoic rocks and fossils of Sweden. Paeckelmann's brachiopod genus was certainly named after A. J. H. Tornquist, a German palaeontologist who published on the Lower Carboniferous of the Vosges and on the Trias and Jurassic of Germany for, although Paeckelmann did not make any specific statement as to whom he was naming his genus after, it is not to be believed that he would have named his genus after a Swedish palaeontologist who wrote exclusively on Swedish Lower Palaeozoic rocks and fossils.

4. The only author who, so far as I am aware, has considered the relative status of the foregoing pair of names is B. K. Licharew (1934, in Zittel, *Grundzüge der Paläontologie* **1** (Invert.) (Russian edition), Leningrad-Moscow: 509, footnote) who took the view that, in spite of the presence of an umlaut over the "o" in the name of the trilobite genus and the absence of an umlaut over the "o" in the name of the brachiopod genus, the two generic names should be regarded as homonyms of one another for the purposes of Article 34; he accordingly gave the substitute name *Paeckelmannia* to the brachiopod genus *Tornquistia* Paeckelmann.

5. After carefully considering this matter, I am of the opinion that the interpretation of Article 34 by Licharew is eminently reasonable, for it would certainly be most confusing if it were permissible under the *Règles* to have, as available generic names, names which differed from one another only in the presence or absence of diacritic marks. I realise however that the difference which distinguishes such names as *Törnquistia* and *Tornquistia* is not one of the differences specified by the International Congress of Zoology (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 161-162) as a difference to be ignored in determining whether any two given names are homonyms of one another and therefore that, as the Congress expressly stipulated that the list of differences which it enumerated is to be treated as an exhaustive list, the differences with which we are here concerned cannot, in the absence of a special ruling by the International Commission, be ignored and therefore that, without such a ruling, names such as those specified above cannot be regarded as homonyms of one another. I accordingly now ask the International Commission to clarify the position by rendering a *Declaration* which would have the effect of making names such as those discussed homonyms of one another.

6. It is important that any ruling on this subject should be drawn in terms wide enough to cover not only the case immediately under consideration but also similar but slightly different cases where considerations of the same kind apply. Thus, I should hope that the ruling would not be confined to the case

presented by scientific names based upon modern patronymics, although it is likely that it is in relation to this class of name that the present problem will most frequently arise. It might however arise in the case of scientific names based on the names of places or even upon words, other than patronymics or place names, drawn from languages other than Latin. It is desirable therefore that the ruling to be given should be so drawn as to cover all cases of this kind.

7. A somewhat similar problem arises when, for example, a name based upon a word containing a letter with (say) an umlaut over it is written not with an umlaut (as in the case of *Törnquistia*) but with an "e" inserted after the vowel concerned (as *Toernquistia*). It would be even more illogical and undesirable to accept as valid generic names both the name *Törnquistia* and *Toernquistia* than it would be to accept as such the names *Törnquistia* and *Tornquistia*. It is accordingly suggested that the ruling now to be given should cover this class of case also.

8. Finally, it is naturally essential that, whatever ruling is given in relation to generic names—the class of case with which the present application is immediately concerned—should apply equally to trivial names.

9. I accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to render a Declaration containing a ruling that, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy in relation both to generic names (Article 34) and to trivial names (Article 35), (1) the presence or absence of a diacritic mark over one or more of the letters in a scientific name derived from a word belonging to some language other than Latin is to be ignored in determining whether that name is a homonym of some other name, and (2) that, where in the formation of a name, the presence of a diacritic mark over one of the letters in the word on which that name is based is indicated not by a diacritic mark but by the insertion of an additional vowel after the letter concerned, the name so transliterated is to be treated as a homonym of any other name based upon the same word and transliterated with a diacritic mark over the vowel in question.

**ON AN AMBIGUITY IN ARTICLE 20 OF THE "RÈGLES"  
BROUGHT TO LIGHT BY DR. HELEN MUIR-WOOD'S  
APPLICATION FOR A RULING ON THE QUESTION OF  
WHETHER NAMES BASED ON WORDS CONTAINING  
LETTERS HAVING A DIACRITIC MARK ARE TO BE  
REGARDED AS HOMONYMS WHEN ONE MEMBER OF A  
PAIR OF SUCH NAMES IS PRINTED WITH A DIACRITIC  
MARK AND IN THE OTHER AN ADDITIONAL VOWEL IS  
USED TO INDICATE WHERE THE DIACRITIC MARK  
APPEARED IN THE WORD ON WHICH THE NAME IS  
BASED: PROPOSED ADOPTION OF A "DECLARATION"**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)540)**

1. In the concluding portion of her application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a ruling on the question whether such